UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/899,539 | 07/06/2001 | David S. Ebbo | 40062.0265US01 | 3399 |
| | 7590 07/14/200 & GOULD (MICROSC | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 2903 | , | AILES, BENJAMIN A | | |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2142 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/14/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 09/899,539 | EBBO ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | BENJAMIN AILES | 2142 | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v | , or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the cont | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje | E below); lucing or simplifying th | | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.24. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.25. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) thow the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the proposed. | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 14-40. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | , | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /Andrew Caldwell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended claim 14 adding "the component object cached using a cache key that comprises an identifier that is unique for each occurrence of the component object" and "each component object being lijnked to a prior component object if a prior component object exists, and each component object being linked to a next component object if a next component object exists", claim 27 adding "the static components and dynamic components being linked to each other in the hierarchical data model", and finally claim 28 adding "inserting the generated page components into a hierarchical tree model at the server computing device, each page component being linked to a prior page component if a prior page component exists, and each page component being linked to a next page component if a next page component exists." The amended claims would have to be evaluated against the prior art and require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment has not been entered because the proposed amendments to the claims require further consideration and/or search. The arguments presented are therefore not considered persuasive.

baa